

By 2001, that figure had risen to 48 percent. Mr. Speaker, 70,000 students are victims of alcohol-related sexual assaults each year. Most of these are date rapes. More than 500,000 students suffer alcohol-related injuries annually.

Despite these statistics, a total of \$53 million in 2001 and \$58 million in 2002 was spent to place ads in college sports programs by the alcohol industry.

The 2002 NCAA basketball tournament had more alcohol ads than the Super Bowl, the World Series, college bowl games, and Monday Night Football combined. Alcohol advertising made up more than twice the percentage of ad spending on college sports of all other television programs in 2001 and 2002. Recent riots at the University of Connecticut and Iowa State, as well as some of the recruiting scandals we have heard about on college campuses, have been fueled largely by alcohol.

A spokesperson from the NCAA recently said, "Alcohol advertising is not inconsistent with our mission." I beg to differ. The NCAA handbook states that NCAA policy should exclude "advertisements that do not seem to be in the best interests of higher education."

As a result of the mixed messages our colleges and universities are sending, I have introduced House Resolution 575 calling upon NCAA member schools to voluntarily ban advertising on college sports broadcasts. This is simply a resolution. It is something I hope that Members of Congress will get behind because we think we need to call attention to the inconsistency of policies that our colleges and universities are promoting.

Dean Smith, the former North Carolina basketball coach who set all kinds of coaching records said this. He said, "If aspirin were the leading cause of death on college campuses, do you think chancellors, presidents, and trustees would allow aspirin commercials on basketball commercials on telecasts. They wouldn't, not for a minute."

I recently speak to Coach John Wooden, who won 10 NCAA basketball championships in 12 years; and he wholeheartedly endorses taking alcohol advertising out of college sports. So I would agree with Dean Smith and Don Wooden, because over 36 years on college campuses, I saw case after case where alcohol was the biggest problem that we encountered.

Apparently others agree: 84 percent of Americans think advertising beer on college games is not in the best interests of higher education; 71 percent of Americans support a ban of alcohol ads on college games; 77 percent of parents say it is wrong for colleges to profit from alcohol advertising while trying to combat alcohol abuse on their campuses.

The problem outlined by the National Academy of Science study goes beyond the college campus. I think this is certainly worthy of note, Mr. Speaker. Underage drinking is a serious issue in our middle schools, in our high

schools and, in some cases, in our elementary schools. We have over 3 million teenage alcoholics in our country today. By the end of the eighth grade, 47 percent of students have engaged in heavy drinking. Most eighth graders are 13 years old. Children who drink before age 15 are four times more likely to become alcohol-dependent than those who wait until after 15. Underage drinking kills 6.5 times more youth than all other illegal drugs combined; and yet this problem flies largely under the radar screen. Underage drinking costs the American taxpayers each year more than \$50 billion. Despite these numbers, the Federal Government spends 25 times more on combating drugs such as cocaine, marijuana, and heroin than on preventing underage alcohol use.

I urge my colleagues to pay attention to this serious problem, as we are going to shortly introduce some legislation to combat this particular issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

IMPORTATION, DISCOUNT CARDS, AND MEDICARE MISINFORMATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to review this week as it relates to the Medicare prescription drug bill.

It started with the Secretary of Health and Human Services announcing on Monday, given the confusion over the Web site that they had put up, that they were going to think about taking it down because there was such confusion out among seniors about the pricing and among the pharmaceutical companies about actually what, in fact, they were offering and whether there was a discount. The Web site was intended, as Tommy Thompson said, to drive prices down.

There was such confusion in the marketplace that on the first day, Health and Human Services Secretary Tommy Thompson said we are thinking of taking the Web site down. Then they launched the big discount card that is supposed to provide somewhere between a 10 to 20 percent discount on prices.

Every year for the last 6 years, prices of prescription drugs have gone up, on

average, 17 percent, somewhere around five times the rate of inflation; and this year it is projected to go up 18 percent, and next year it is projected to go up 20 percent. The card was so confusing that at the Speaker's own town hall meeting, he got into an argument with a senior citizen who said, why do we not just do what Canada does and offer and, in fact, allow us to buy drugs in Canada where they are 30 to 80 percent cheaper? In fact, if you compare the discount that the drug card would offer like on Lipitor versus what the price is in Canada or Europe, even with the discount card, the prices for Lipitor in Europe are 129 percent cheaper than they are even with the discount card. Celebrex, another common drug, even with the discount price from the card, in Europe and in Canada, the price is 85 percent cheaper. Seniors know that.

Third, just this week, the Congressional Research Service found that, in fact, the cost of the bill for prescription drugs was never \$400 billion, but \$534 billion, and that the administrator, Mr. Foster, who intended to tell Congress, was told he was not allowed to and withheld the information from Congress; that in fact the Members who told him that have broken the law; broken the law.

I will tell my colleagues today, if that bill was on the floor, it would go down in resounding defeat, because people in Congress who thought they were getting all of the protection from the pharmaceutical industry have realized finally, having talked to their constituents, what is wrong with this bill. It does nothing to affect price. So we can have all the discount cards we want, we can have a Web site that is a failure, and now we have information out there that, in fact, people broke the law trying to pass this bill, and we now know what seniors have always told us. Since the bill did nothing to affect price, nothing to affect affordability, nothing to give them world-class drugs at world-class prices, which is the cheapest prices we could get, that in fact Congress was deceived and not given the information that was required to deal with that legislation.

Just today, at 5:30 in the evening, Secretary Tommy Thompson, having fought tooth and nail to oppose the notion of allowing people to buy drugs in Canada and in Europe and to bring competition to the market and bring choice to the market, at 5:30 this evening Tommy Thompson announced that he believes in the reimportation of prescription drugs, that we should pass legislation, and he would recommend that the President sign that legislation. So in the last 48 hours, I just want my colleagues to review this with me.

The Congressional Research Service has found out that members of the administration broke the law by withholding information from Congress. The Web site that they put up to help bring competition to the market, they

are going to bring the Web site down because it is confusing and they have the wrong prices up there. The discount card is so confusing that on a report on NPR this morning, if you listened to the official trying to listen to the senior citizen, the official said, "A mail order's around a 90-day. That's a 3-month supply." Senior: "Oh, okay." Official: "So to compare the prices, multiply." The senior: "Multiply the 3?" The official: "The 30-day by 3 to get your 90 days, yup. And not all of them have mail orders, so." Senior: "Mm-humm." The official: "And then this will tell how many pharmacies are in your area. How far would you like to go from our ZIP code to look for a pharmacy? You want to keep it within a mile?" The senior starts laughing. The official: "We do have other choices, there's a range here."

This, to a senior citizen who is looking for a lifesaving drug on arthritis, heart, blood pressure, bone strengthening. They are supposed to sit there and try to figure this out. Rather than giving them a benefit and rather than trying to organize and bring prices down in the market, we drive them crazy.

So to top it off, Tommy Thompson now has come around to the view that in fact what we need and to deal with this is what all of us know who dared talk to any of our constituents, that we have got to deal with price. That is the only way to affect and help our senior citizens and our taxpayers, who now are going to be asked not to pay \$400 billion, but \$535 billion for a bill that if it was brought forward today would go down in resounding defeat.

I welcome Tommy Thompson's open mind and bipartisanship to come to realize what all of us knew in this Congress, that we need reimportation to bring down the prices of prescription drugs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

NO APOLOGY REQUIRED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, last week, several Members of this body issued statements criticizing Presidential adviser Karen Hughes, demanding an apology for comments she made on April 25, 2004. Unfortunately, my colleagues have distorted her remarks into a misrepresentation of her actual sentiment, which I fully support.

In a live interview on CNN on April 25, Ms. Hughes is quoted as saying, "I think after September 11 the American

people are valuing life more and realizing that we need policies to value the dignity and worth of every life.

"And President Bush has worked to say, let's be reasonable, let's work to value life, let's try to reduce the number of abortions, let's increase adoptions."

She goes on to say, "Unfortunately our enemies in the terror network, as we're seeing repeatedly in the headlines these days, don't value any life, not even the innocent and not even their own." That was on CNN "Late Edition," April 25, 2004.

In response to her words, some of my colleagues have accused Hughes of equating those who support abortion with terrorists. They have requested an apology for this alleged use of "cheap and distasteful politics." I find this gross misrepresentation of Ms. Hughes' comments disgusting and firmly stand behind her words.

Mr. Speaker, this demand for an apology is simply a political ploy designed to damage the pro-life movement and to promote the abortion industry and their pursuit of increased abortions. Abortion is a money-making business, and the pro-abortion movement will take any chance they can to derail those who promote life.

Planned Parenthood's budget for fiscal year ending June of 2002 showed total revenue of \$692.5 million, and they had a profit of \$12.2 million for that 1-year period alone.

Personally, I would like to thank Karen Hughes for her words because she was right; and, no, I will not apologize.

□ 1945

Although Mrs. Hughes did not insinuate that these groups were terrorists, I find it amazing that these pro-abortion groups, like Planned Parenthood, have the gall to claim that they are "offended" at this accusation.

Offended? Let me read to you some of the signs that were displayed at the pro-abortion rally in DC a few weeks ago. These were signs that did not make it to the mainstream newspaper. From World Magazine, May 8 edition, their signs read, "Abort Bush. We are pro-choice and we riot. Keep Bush's hands out of my pants."

Offended? I am personally offended as every American should be. And these groups claim to speak for all women. It is these very same groups that have repeatedly called pro-life groups like Concerned Women for American "terrorists." Yes, Planned Parenthood likes to use the word "terrorist" any time they deem it politically useful.

Recently, I saw on Planned Parenthood Federation's Web site a page entitled "Eye on Extremism," and under the heading titled "Terrorists and Extremist Organizations" was a detailed listing of 14 leading pro-life organizations.

I am familiar with the majority over these groups and it is clear that Planned Parenthood is simply working on a smear campaign.

So I have a question for Planned Parenthood: How can such a claim be made against Hughes, an unsubstantiated claim I might add, when groups advocating family and pro-life policies are branded as extremists and terrorists? Planned Parenthood, are you going to apologize for these groups for, as you put it, "cheap and distasteful politics."

A national Right to Life poll has indicated growing opposition to abortion; 56 percent of women, 62 percent of African Americans, 79 percent of Hispanics, 61 percent of 18 to 29 year olds reject abortion in most circumstances. Americans recognize the value of life.

As Mrs. Hughes stated, in the post-9-11 world, we as Americans have placed a greater emphasis on the value of life. We grieve for the loss of every soldier in Iraq and Afghanistan, cling tighter to our close friends and family, and are more conscientious of our personal and national security. Additionally, we celebrate the birth of every baby and adoption of every child into a loving family because we value each life.

Mrs. Hughes' comments in the April 25th interview were right on target.

The demand for an apology is absurd, and I would like to know if Planned Parenthood is going to apologize to the groups that they list as terrorists on their Web site. I doubt it, because each child saved from an abortion is money that the abortion industry will not get. And that, unfortunately, is what this is all about.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENTIAL MISTAKES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last month, not too long ago, the President was asked in a news conference, only his third news conference in prime time since he took office, What would your biggest mistake be after 9-11 and what lessons have you learned from it?

President Bush said, "I'm sure something will pop in to my mind here in the midst of this press conference, with all pressure of trying to come up with an answer but it hasn't yet."